

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Initially, the indication that claims 2-24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the section 112 rejections is appreciatively noted. In response, the specific section 112 rejections noted by the office action have been obviated.

The specification stands objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "an optical axis", "an optical train", "an optical part" and a "movable device". Initially, the point in the official action about the pulley being rotatable rather than movable is well taken, and accordingly the term "movable device" has been changed to "rotatable device" where appropriate. Antecedent for "optical axis", "optical part" and "rotatable device" have been added to the specification.

Claims 2-24 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In response, many of these claims are amended herewith for definiteness.

In claim 2, the optical source was recited as projecting a light beam "along an optical axis". Hence, this is believed clear in context. The specification has also been amended to use this word in context. No new matter has been added, since

this would be easily understood when referring to the specification as a whole. The "optical axis" is quite clear in context: it is an axis along which the light beam is projected.

Claims 6-8 further define different specific structures that form the generic "optical part". The terms "moved" and "movable" has been changed throughout the claims to -rotatable- or -rotated-.

The antecedent issue in claim 17 is also been corrected.

The preambles in claim 11 and 17 have been amended to recite the purpose of the method, as requested

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that

all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address harris@schiplaw.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this responseto Deposit Account No. 50-4376, small entity.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_10/31/07\_\_\_\_\_ \_/Scott C Harris/\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott C. Harris  
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 74162  
Law Office of Scott C. Harris  
P.O. Box 1389  
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067  
Telephone: (858) 756-7778  
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717